



**Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal Project
Public Scoping Comment Summary Report
Appendix A**

October 18 – November 17, 2004



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**



Appendix A

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OCTOBER 18, 2004 – NOVEMBER 17, 2004 SCOPING PERIOD

The table below includes the full text of all the comments that were received during the public scoping period for the Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal Project. (WSF did receive comments outside the formal comment period and has incorporated those comments into the scoping record.) Open house participants were asked to fill out a comment form and the answers are included in the text of comments (Q1, Q2, etc.) The comment form questions are listed at the end of the document.

ID*	Comment Source	Comment
2	E-mail Request	<p>The following are my concerns with the project and suggestions for possible solutions:</p> <p>CONCERNS-</p> <p>We presently have a problem with ferry traffic on SR 525 and with commuters parking on our streets and private parking lots. Since we have committed to building a multi-modal transportation facility, I want to see that you provide a plan that solves these problems not just when the project is opened, but 20 years into the future.</p> <p>SOLUTION-</p> <p>The consultants for the Port of Everett have determined that it is not economically feasible to develop the narrow strip of tank farm property East of your project site. As a general contractor who has just finished the construction of 4 commercial buildings, I tend to agree. From the waters edge to the South property line is only 200 feet. The City of Mukilteo will require a street with a 75 foot ROW and a promenade of 25 feet wide along the waterfront. This leaves only 100 feet of buildable land less any setbacks, parking, etc... (stream buffer). Test pits dug for the Port's Rail/Barge facility showed wood debris down 10 feet from the old sawmill that once operated on the site. Buildings may need to be built on pilings, which is very expensive.</p> <p>I suggest you look at using this property from your project site to the Rail/Barge facility for parking. This may hold enough cars to permanently close the ferry holding lane on the SR 525 which could then be converted to a second uphill lane. This would move departing ferry traffic much faster and allow residents more access to the highway. It would also reduce the accidents due to the traffic problems caused by the holding lane. It is possible that this property would provide enough parking so you would not need to spend the extra \$20 million to provide a parking dock to hold 260 cars. If this is the case some of the savings could be used to move the boat launch from Mukilteo's Lighthouse Park to the East end of the tank farm, which is what the City has wanted to do.</p> <p>Please at least consider this option to see if it is even feasible.</p>
3	E-mail Request	Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider.
5	Port of Everett meeting	We are in support of the plan as presented at tonight's meeting. Nicole did a good job!
7	Port of Everett meeting	Concerned about impacts of ferry access road on neighborhood. Q2: traffic
8	Scoping Mailer	I agree with you in every way. It's needed it for many years. I researched that, seen years ago and we talked about it.
9	Scoping Mailer	Move Ahead! Don't sit around like the City of Seattle is still doing with their mono and light rail. Do the study and build!
11	Scoping Mailer	Looks like a grand step forward for transportation magic to occur. Thanks.
12	Scoping Mailer	This is very important for Whidbey Island to get started on. I will be too old to be involved but will enjoy the needed progress. Good luck!
15	Scoping Mailer	Please consider leaving Japanese Gulch intact! It is a special birding area and there is a roost of blue heron. Traffic is going to be a problem. Q2: traffic
16	Scoping Mailer	Why does it take so long to do a project that is needed?! The tank farm is there, build and use it and do it quickly! The longer it takes the more it will cost.
17	Scoping Mailer	Thank you for keeping the smelly/stinky room deodorizers out of the bathrooms. My son has bad asthma.
18	Scoping Mailer	Looking forward to seeing this project completed!
20	Scoping Mailer	Yes, I agree that a new terminal is needed. It won't do me much good because I hardly ever leave the Island at my age, retired 24 years.
21	Scoping Mailer	We do not want any growth allowances. Removing the ferry line eliminates the romance.
22	Scoping Mailer	You're going the right direction and improvements are surely needed.

* Numbers may appear omitted as a function of the database numbering system. No comments have been excluded.

24	Scoping Mailer	Suggestion: Have toll booths that use a scanner to read a prepaid or debit WSF card for commuters' vehicles. Should speed things up.
26	Scoping Mailer	Everything I need to know is extremely well-presented in your "Project News". Go for it! Sounds great!
27	Scoping Mailer	Forget the ferry system, a real OLD drain on tax payers--But an underground tunnel (leave the ferry for tourists) like BART in San Francisco.
35	Scoping Mailer	My concern is with the current ferry back-up lines up the speedway--there are rarely state patrol officers checking out the lines and directing when it gets up past the holding lane.
37	Scoping Mailer	No access to Japanese Gulch! It's one of the few green spaces left & there is wildlife living there. Re-route a ferry to downtown Everett to help with ferry traffic-- good for bus commuters, Blvd & speedway, and good for downtown Everett Q2: environment
38	Scoping Mailer	This project is way past due. Energy is rising and gas for autos will continue to rise.
39	Scoping Mailer	I trust your reports will include information about projected impact on fares and discount packages (under \$96).
43	Scoping Mailer	At this point, more questions come to mind than comments since I have no idea yet of the issues to be considered. Will this project involve relocation? What about cost and its effect on future fares? I am a senior citizen with extremely limited income, and the ferry fares are already prohibitively high for me, to the extent that I cannot attend many cultural events off-island or visit people on the mainland except on very rare occasions.
46	Scoping Mailer	Need parking lot to allow use of commuter rail and public transit! Q2: parking Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
47	Scoping Mailer	We do not want higher taxes for another project, especially using higher union-only labor. Nor promises of a cost and then inevitable "cost overruns". Run this as a business, not a government entity.
50	Scoping Mailer	Please allow operations of ferry so that I can get to work at Sea-Tac at 5:30 am & friends can get on flights!!
51	Scoping Mailer	Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
54	Scoping Mailer	Please add my name to the project mailing list, so that I may be kept informed of the entire development process.
56	Scoping Mailer	Would love to see the area developed into a user-friendly area. Particularly for walkers and bicyclers. Q2: public access to the waterfront
58	Scoping Mailer	Wish we could avoid coming through Mukilteo--with traffic cutting into the ferry line and coming from all directions Q2: traffic
59	Scoping Mailer	We need a dual slip north of the existing one at Taylors Landing with a combined terminal for the ferry, bus and train with several amenities, i.e. food kiosks--separate areas for walk-ons and disabled passengers. Away from the vehicles to avoid injury. Q2: safety Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: economic opportunities
62	Scoping Mailer	Where is the new location going to be? The old fuel station the navy had? Access? Japanese Gulch?
65	Scoping Mailer	Your objectives are perfect! A more user-friendly holding facility at Clinton for walk-ons and vehicle holding would seriously help.
67	Scoping Mailer	Increased capacity would be a benefit.
70	Scoping Mailer	Can you guys build a small marina next to the new ferry terminal? That would be much appreciated by many!
71	Scoping Mailer	Project looks great--wish we could build it sooner
72	Scoping Mailer	Great Plan! Go for it! The sooner the better!
73	Scoping Mailer	1)Thank you for recognizing that current demand is not being met. 2) Think loading should be "first come, first serve", not HOV priority loading 3) Support pick-up/drop off space!!
75	Scoping Mailer	You people are involved in a huge project for sure--I want you to know it is seriously appreciated!!
77	Scoping Mailer	I support your idea subject to an all-inclusive comprehensive plan I can understand and support
79	Scoping Mailer	More needed than any of the planned changes, are extra ferry runs during peak time, I believe. Wait times are biggest problem for me.
81	Scoping Mailer	No! Save the money. I live on \$985 a month. Please stop spending money! We are being taxed to death. We don't use the ferry, we drive around IF we must come to town.
82	Scoping Mailer	My objection how this will change this whole lovely area to more congestion (beauty, quiet no more)- letting this terminal take over. I am 80 and I've enjoyed it for 60 years. Progress? Q2: traffic Q2: environment
83	Scoping Mailer	Let's get started! The sooner the better. I commute by ferry and bus everyday, and an updated dock and terminal is a must!
84	Scoping Mailer	We think the project is needed and look forward to its development--a compressed timeline if at all possible would be desirable
85	Scoping Mailer	We think the project is needed and look forward to its development--a compressed timeline if at all possible would be desirable
89	Scoping Mailer	Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q3: suggested changes- Have Washington State Ferries build a ferry terminal on the Port of Everett land. Everett has always wanted traffic to help business in the area.

		Q5: notice mailing
90	Scoping Mailer	It does appear that by the time this project is completed it will be even More over due!
91	Scoping Mailer	Where is the money coming from?
93	Scoping Mailer	I urge you to expand the current access to the ferry rather than destroy more raw land. Let ferry riders wait or provide parking for walk-on passengers. Cars can't rule everywhere. Q2: environment Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
94	Scoping Mailer	As a Mukilteo resident, it's the disruption in traffic, both foot and car, during the ferry's disembarking string that concerns us most. Q2: traffic
97	Scoping Mailer	I hope Sound Transit Service from Mukilteo is not going to wait until this new terminal is built. Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
100	Scoping Mailer	We need two slips Mukilteo side and I would like to catch a train to SeaTac Airport at the tracks via Mukilteo Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
101	Scoping Mailer	"Keep it simple" keep it open 24/7
102	Scoping Mailer	I strongly endorse the project. I believe it is badly needed.
103	Scoping Mailer	This is an aggressive proposal that needs to be in step with Mukilteo strategic planning which is somewhat unclear.
107	Scoping Mailer	Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
108	Scoping Mailer	Anything is better than the total mess we now have. Please get three boats operating!
109	Scoping Mailer	I totally support this project at its proposed location. Train connection very important. Use Japanese Gulch! It will be lovely and useful - add trail! Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
112	Scoping Mailer	YES! YES! YES! It's about time that you could walk off the ferry and get on a train and get to Seattle or Vancouver—it would be great if you could connect to airport! Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
113	Scoping Mailer	Greatly needed project that will give us a future
114	Scoping Mailer	I think Mukilteo needs a movie theater planned in this area
116	Scoping Mailer	I wish that since it is still a long time away that the ferry holding line would have to stay back further than my driveway, as I cannot see to get out. It is VERY dangerous. Q2: traffic
117	Scoping Mailer	Why pay out for the major overhaul when you're planning to have "future access" at Japanese Gulch? That should be your first project & everything else after. P.S. noticed that people have to speak English when calling. It's about time this is initiated in out country. Yes!!
118	Scoping Mailer	Please consider priority loading or ? For patrons with prepaid fares (commuter tickets). Also, use barcodes on prepaid tickets for use with wireless barcode readers
122	Scoping Mailer	Good thinking here. Please keep us posted
123	Scoping Mailer	We need a small access road from & to Mukilteo Blvd. - for local residents Q2: traffic
124	Scoping Mailer	Much needed improvement
128	Scoping Mailer	Change is needed--lets plan and move forward
134	Scoping Mailer	I'd like to see priority loading for commuters over tourists. Especially in peak season
136	Scoping Mailer	I live two blocks off the speedway and find ferry traffic to be a minor nuisance. I am strongly against a road through Japanese Gulch-It's not necessary and would ruin the hidden jewel of Mukilteo- Japanese Gulch Q2: traffic
138	Scoping Mailer	This publication does not address parking short and long-term. I assume that you will have to include a substantial provision for parking. Q2: parking
139	Scoping Mailer	Please be sure to include provisions for neighborhood walkers to come safely to and from the neighborhood to walk along the waterfront Q2: safety
141	Scoping Mailer	We are Mukilteo Residents and are very interested in the project
143	Scoping Mailer	Thanks for this input!! This is valuable "info".
144	Scoping Mailer	I like the new terminal you have described here, but hurry and get it done. I am 90 years old and like to use it.
145	Scoping Mailer	Glad to hear Mukilteo dock is planned to have separate passenger loading (overhead bridge). Still don't know why Clinton dock did not include this in it's expansion
150	Scoping Mailer	Why not just move it to Everett?
151	Scoping Mailer	Great ideas!
152	Scoping Mailer	STRONGLY AGAINST any access through Japanese Gulch!!
153	Scoping Mailer	Agree but only with new road/access via Japanese Gulch.
157	Scoping Mailer	The ferry terminal should be moved entirely to Everett instead of continuing to overcrowd Mukilteo.

161	Scoping Mailer	I am on the board at Scatchet Head. I am interested in helping this go.
162	Scoping Mailer	Eventually, additional access to the waterfront, presumably via Japanese Gulch, will be needed to accommodate future needs.
163	Scoping Mailer	The project timeline is extraordinary! Too long, too much taxpayer money wasted in the process. Having accomplished public outreach on a nuclear site, I know this can be done more efficiently. Project timeline will automatically create overruns. \$
168	Scoping Mailer	The project is indeed needed. Happy it's to come about.
169	Scoping Mailer	We are disappointed in the lengthy timeline of the project. This is definitely a necessary improvement and think it should be expedited quickly.
170	Scoping Mailer	Great idea!
171	Scoping Mailer	Please, please, please make accommodations for commuter traffic (i.e.- and express lane). We are the travelers who provide the most revenue and support of the ferry system. It could be very much the same process Canada uses at their border.
172	Scoping Mailer	As a long time Mukilteo resident, I strongly favor routing ferry traffic through Japanese Gulch.
173	Scoping Mailer	A new terminal is needed.
175	Scoping Mailer	Include in project the same overhead pedestrian bridge (load/off-load) at Clinton Ferry docks.
177	E-mail Request	<p>I look forward to attending the Nov. 9 meeting at the Mukilteo Water Dist. building. As you found out at the last public meeting, traffic is the no. 1 issue with the citizens of Mukilteo. The sooner the project is completed the sooner the vehicle queuing problem goes away. At least for a few years. Are WSDOT Highway people going to the meeting?</p> <p>Timing of the project is a big issue with me. So, a question I plan on asking is, when do you expect to submit your JARPA application to the Army Corp. and WSFW? Maybe that answer will come out in the opening presentation.</p> <p>The JARPA process can take up to 18 months for permits, or maybe longer. So, the sooner the applications are submitted the sooner the permit public process can begin. Expect public hearings with the corp., etc. The Port of Everett is going through this now with the Boeing Rail/Barge project.</p> <p>The way I see it, the in water work will have to be phased over a couple of years since the work window is Jul 15 to Oct 15 of any year. In comparison to Clinton's project this one is huge for in water work. The Government pier has to be removed, hundreds of pilings installed, wingwalls and dolphins built, etc. The chosen contractor will love this one.</p> <p>Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q2: environment Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q4: Temporary or overflow parking area for queuing to relieve congestion at 76th St. and SR-525. A proposal is to use that land area between the NOAA land and railroad. Traffic would enter from the existing ticket booth site to the temporary site then exit back to ticket booth holding area and on to ferry site--could hold maybe 150 plus vehicles. Q5: notice mailing</p>
182	Scoping Mailer	Go for it! I think it's a really valuable project in all ways.
183	Scoping Mailer	<p>Q1: I live nearby Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: other- Access to SeaTac Airport Terminal Q3: No preference Q5: newspaper</p>
185	Scoping Mailer	Funding for this project should come from the ferry riders.
186	Scoping Mailer	We wish a transit center and Sounder Commuter Rail Station could happen BEFORE all other construction is begun or finished.
188	Scoping Mailer	I look out over the old tank farm and I am concerned about the proposed height restrictions increasing. I do not want my view disturbed.
191	Scoping Mailer	<p>Aging and disability make ferry terminal interface with non-commuter ground transportation to downtown Seattle vital.</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p>
192	Scoping Mailer	I love the dock expansion idea. I have concerns regarding the wildlife in Japanese Gulch, so don't want to have a road through there
194	Scoping Mailer	<p>Please route off-loading traffic to SR525/Boeing Freeway via Mukilteo Speedway, via Japanese Gulch if necessary.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p>
196	Scoping Mailer	I want a job on the Planning Committee. Thank You!
198	Scoping Mailer	Faster loading! (i.e. I hate getting stuck behind & missing a ferry because they have cash & I have a ferry ticket ready!! Would love to see a Lockheed-martin type of expedition lane w/ scanners for cars w/ stickers that pay frequent travel fares & a dedicated lane for such use--automated account deductions per use of ferry systems
200	Scoping Mailer	Please hurry the project along, as you are about five years late.
202	Scoping Mailer	What is planned for the current loading zone? Will it be transferred to the city of Mukilteo?
203	Scoping Mailer	<p>Please add my name to the project mailing list..."and all other steps" This is premature!! Let's see FTA money.</p> <p>Too many planners.</p>

204	Scoping Mailer	Government owned land should be used for the people --not just for profit--project needs to meet need for 40-50 + years.
205	Scoping Mailer	PRIORITY: 1) Better pedestrian movement to/from ferries, trains, busses. 2) Increase # ferry docks 3) auto wait enlarge areas. Just DON'T study it to death! Make sound business decisions. Can't please everyone! Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
207	Scoping Mailer	I would like more information. It seems to me that millions will be poured into helping a very small % of the travelers. I think this is only a band aid solution.
213	Scoping Mailer	I applaud the idea and the planning effort. Would like to get out of my car and utilize public transport. Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
215	Scoping Mailer	I would hope that in the redevelopment of the property there would be as much open and green spaces as possible.
216	Scoping Mailer	You seem to be assuming a lot...In assuming that the people of Mukilteo want a ferry system with all its present problems.
218	Scoping Mailer	If the Japanese Gulch terminal had gone forward when it was first proposed we would be twenty-five years ahead by now.
220	Scoping Mailer	I find the goals of your project excellent. As a frequent user of the ferries, I look forward to your progress
225	Scoping Mailer	Great! It's about time we get this show on the road. Looking forward to the exciting new dock in 2010.
226	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q2: environment Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: other- Why is the terminal being built without any plan to take care of the additional traffic? The speedway cannot handle the traffic as it is. Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- road down Japanese Gulch to be done at same time as terminal is being built. Q5: newspaper
227	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q1: other- Very interested in all visitor type activities that facilitate entry of transportation Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: public access to the waterfront Q2: economic opportunities Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- Very reasonable to handle traffic & use of area. Q5: notice mailing Q5: newspaper
228	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q1: other- Concern about traffic pollution etc...on SR-525 Q2: traffic Q2: environment Q2: public access to the waterfront Q2: other-525 is anything but a "speedway" and we're going to overload it. Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q5: notice mailing
229	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q2: safety Q5: notice mailing Q5: newspaper
230	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: public access to the waterfront Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- How about using the existing tank farm pier? (parking and holding area) Q4: Floating bridge alternative ever considered? Q5: newspaper

235	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other- There does not appear to be areas (in either plan) for ferry personnel to park and walk on the ferry. No parking for bus riders.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- More parking for Sound Transit drivers and/or ferry riders that park to walk on ferry. From plans it is difficult to assess the flow of traffic from the dock area to city streets & 525. What facilities will be available to fuel and service the ferries to ensure no fuel, sewage, etc. get into the water?</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
238	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to the waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
239	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: The road development through Japanese Gulch needs a higher priority.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
240	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to the waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- There should be direct freeway access provided in the plan. Parking for walk on ferry riders needs to be a concern.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: Have daily commuters been asked where they are going and would they use the sound transit if it was available?</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
243	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Because of earthquakes! Even if you meet federal and/or state standards, you still have the potential for dumping the 260 vehicles in the water if you use the CTA. As a business owner, I would normally prefer the CTA because of maximizing use of land.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
244	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: other- I live in the city and use the state highway frequently</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: public access to the waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- I feel any new ferry terminal/multimodal facility should involve minimal construction and a large park and ride should be provided several miles uphill with efficient shuttle service to discourage as much auto traffic from the waterfront as possible.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Cost is clearly the most important overriding consideration as well as effect on the shoreline and beach access.</p> <p>Q4: Regardless of what multimodal facility is built, I favor a separate access road down Japanese Gulch to relieve traffic congestion on the state highway. I also favor paying for this road at least partially if not totally with financing repaid through a road toll for ferry users. In the best of all possible worlds, the ferry terminal would be relocated outside of Mukilteo.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
245	Scoping Mailer	<p>Any future access via Japanese Gulch needs to avoid any link-ups with the residential areas in the Goat Trail neighborhood; would result in congestion and hazardous conditions in a residential area.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p>
246	Scoping Mailer	<p>Hope you give details of all other public transport connections from proposed terminal--commuter trains, long-haul trains, express buses to Seattle; etc.</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p>

247	Scoping Mailer	I would like Amtrak to service Mukilteo as well as bus, ferry, and heavy commuter rail (sounder). Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
248	Scoping Mailer	Must be an Amtrak station for the Cascades Empire Builder for Whidbey Island Amtrak passengers. Mukilteo was a great Northern Railway stop in the "40's" Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike
249	Scoping Mailer	If you are planning the separation of cars and passengers during loading and unloading, will you also be updating Clinton for the same? Q1: I live nearby Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: other- Really looking forward to a rail terminal at Mukilteo which would get me to downtown Seattle without an auto! Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- Feel it secures more of the property in a KNOWN development. It would allow density, low profile, versus and condo development on the oil tank remaining site. Don't like putting autos parked out over the water. Q5: notice mailing
250	Scoping Mailer	I'm against more ferry traffic, against spending millions for unneeded buildings and against more roads, more taxes and higher ferry fares. Especially during a depression. Most of all we don't need a police state and unconstitutional searches, dogs and new security offices for Gestapo. (infowars.com)
254	Scoping Mailer	The white apts./eyesore of a building at the current dock should serve as an example of what not to allow at the new terminal. This beautiful Mukilteo setting should be protected both below and above the water.
258	Scoping Mailer	I am in favor of using Japanese Gulch for car access to the new terminal. It is the only practical way. Get the cars off the speedway! (SR 525) Q2: traffic
259	Scoping Mailer	Design specs do not have same at Clinton--overhead pedestrian, bike space, space for commercial operators, HOV bypass--so why are these important now?
263	Scoping Mailer	Glad to see the plan for improvement, thanks for keeping us informed.
264	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider Q2: traffic Q2: environment Q2: public access to the waterfront Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q5: newspaper
265	Scoping Mailer	Question: Why can't the new terminal be built in or near Everett?
267	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: public access to the waterfront Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- Selection of the compact alternative at \$20 million plus in added costs can only be justified if the 4 acres saved benefits permanent public beach access, rather than unneeded and undesirable commercial development in the area. Q5: notice mailing
270	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike Q2: public access to the waterfront Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q5: notice mailing
271	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: safety Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes- More opportunity for growth/expansion. Pedestrian bridge over rail tracks to Mukilteo. Shuttle from ferry terminal to off-site overnight parking. Q5: newspaper

273	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: other- My work on Cascadia Project is focused on regional transportation. See drawings by J. Craig Thorpe left with Joy Goldenberg. Thank you</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike-</p> <p>Q2: other-Would like to see Sounder/Amtrak build a Mukilteo station--even a provisional station--as soon as possible. Currently drive to Edmonds & ride train to Seattle from there.</p> <p>Q4: My comment would be as a resident, I would like to see the train come in so I can commute downtown from Mukilteo. Currently I drive to Edmonds and catch the train there. I would like to see even a provisional station built while the permanent intermodal hub is being designed, planned, and constructed. The Japanese Gulch seems to offer much long-term potential, although I realize engineering feat may be involved. That's it.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: Notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
274	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
275	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: other- I'm concerned about environmental impact, especially on the near shore.</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike-</p> <p>Q2: other-I am surprisingly impressed by the attention given to coordinating with train and bus routes. This can be a model of how all of us could/should be commuting!</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-Concerns with both. Major concern for both is toxic runoff of copper, nickel and petroleum products. Needs superior storm water management LID, especially permeable paving for parking areas a necessity? Consult cities of Bellingham and Seattle for good examples!</p> <p>Q4: Also concerned about near shore vulnerability. Question: Is a fishing pier anywhere in the near shore safe? I have heard that sediments at old docks are quite polluted.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
276	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: other- Concerned about HOV lane making timing to appointments even more uncertain. Van pools are good, but general traffic 2+, 3+ passengers will cause uncertain stress.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
277	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- Interested/concerned about shoreline development</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: environment- Opportunities for eventual daylighting of Japanese Creek. Long-term care and protection for stream and habitat in Japanese Gulch.</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
278	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- Ride approximately once or twice per month</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: Enough daily parking day or overnight. If one cares to take ferry from Clinton to Mukilteo and ride transit to Seattle, Vancouver, etc.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
279	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>

280	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- I don't want tall buildings on landing circle. I don't want traffic through the gulch area.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- I don't want parking all along the waterfront. No Gulch roadway!</p> <p>Q4: No Gulch roadway! I don't feel that the issue of noise has been adequately addressed. It will not be sufficient just adding a few trees to "cut down the noise". Please remember that you are moving a commercial arena from a commercial area already designated, and moving the project to a residential area. The light of the piers, holding dock and park lots will be enormous. It will be like looking at a lighted football field x 2 every night. So much for the quiet peaceful and starry night. Why can't the bus bays and other assorted parking be on the south end? Perhaps some compromise with the residents is warranted. Perhaps the buses can be in the old holding area (that is the present site for cars). Also it makes more sense for the Sounder trains to be closer to the commercial areas as well. I can't imagine that the present commercial businesses that have blossomed and count on monies from the ferry passengers are too delighted with the move. If the buses and trains were located in the commercial areas, closer to downtown, they might still be able to survive. I feel that there is too much commercial commotion that will be in a quiet residential area. Each of these individual transportation systems will cause a LOT of noise and commotion. Please don't disregard all the commotion and noise simply because it is not a "ferry transportation mode." Why can't the pier be a walking/fishing pier for the public? How can you be sure that you have addressed the ecological questions, particularly sea-life that is already there?</p> <p>Q5: friend</p>
281	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- Traffic implications for Clinton</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- Supporting community needs for traffic calming, necessary infrastructure for traffic, pedestrian access and safety, lack of both general parking and Island Transit parking.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- If the area could accommodate additional parking facilities to allow ferry users to more fully utilize non-personal vehicle transportation.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
282	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: other- Beach front access is important to me. As a diver I am concerned with the affect on the marine environment. Also, a dock to be able to continue to launch a boat is important.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
283	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Schedule trains earlier in AM to get to Seattle by 6:15 am.</p> <p>Q5: other</p>
284	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Critical to maximize waterfront access & minimize environmental disruption. Traffic is really bad only on weekends in summer--we will have to live with this project every day of the year!</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
285	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q4: It looks like a good project. People were informative and helpful and friendly.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>

286	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: My business is affected by the ferry</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: We in the Clinton community are presently having trouble getting cooperation with WSDOT in providing 525 section with relief of traffic going through our community. We are definitely going to have to have additional help when this new terminal is built and the surge of new traffic comes with it.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
287	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Because it appears that it would fit better with traffic routed through the Gulch, setting the main traffic off the lower part of the speedway and rerouted over through the J Gulch seems to me to make a lot of sense.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
288	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other-Traffic is most important to me.</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q4: Let's talk about the signal light on HW 525 and Columbia Beach Drive - it is already hard to get into the highway, even though we have a light. Something will have to be done if we go to three ferries. Peak hours will be very hard for neighborhood traffic.</p> <p>Q5: Notice Mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p> <p>Q5: friend</p>
289	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- Minimize parking! Must have bike access (kayak?). Mitigate adverse impacts through shoreline restoration and restoration of Japanese Creek and Eelgrass beds. Continuous waterfront promenade through entire length of project.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Minimize use of land to allow for other uses. Construct multi-use (e.g. employee & sounder & CT) parking garage to minimize footprint on the land. Get the holding lanes off the speedway.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
290	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: other- Ability to get on a ferry without missing boats waiting.</p> <p>Q3: Not enough knowledge to comment.</p> <p>Q4: Would much prefer preferential loading only to carpools not HOV. Some people may transport their own children and would be considered HOV - I don't believe they should have preference. Only designated carpools as it is today.</p> <p>Q5: Notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
291	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other- Please send me information on the environmental impact studies.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>

292	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: other- My lifestyle is affected by the ferry. Everything we do in Mukilteo is affected by ferry traffic</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q2: other- Ferry parking is not a responsibility of Mukilteo. Needs to be addressed as plan I put together.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Waterfront not intended to be used as the parking lot of the world.</p> <p>Q4: Really need to include in original plan the road way up Japanese Gulch.</p> <p>Q5: other</p>
293	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- Connections is priority, followed by traffic and parking</p> <p>Q3: I wasn't able to learn the plus and minus of the alternatives. That info was not present.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
294	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q2: other- The Puget Sound is slowly being poisoned by nonpoint pollution. The long term environmental costs are very real concerns for the Whidbey economy. Many of us who earn a living on-island do so at the grace of tourists who come to experience a preserved and seemingly pristine natural environment.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Putting the waiting cars on a holding platform over the water appears to be an expensive and environmentally unsound concept. All the gas and oil that would leak into the near shore habitat where a lot of divers put in does not seem like an appropriate response to the challenge of holding waiting vehicles.</p> <p>Q4: A waterside promenade for folks parked in the holding areas seems to be missing - you show a hardscape plaza but what about a park and trail connections to the lighthouse park?</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: friend</p>
295	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
297	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- With best facility for the buck!</p> <p>Q4: Parking facility for those who want to come to Island for a half day etc. Others could have a lot: private, port, city of Mukilteo.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p> <p>Q5: other</p>

298	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- Meeting Mukilteo comp. plan</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- Maintain Mukilteo zoning code for building height and sight corridors. No high rise condos. Include waterfront walkway through entire length of project--Boeing pier to Mukilteo city park. Do not allow spot zoning in this area.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Minimize parking at the train station area to train riders only. Make effective use of the existing ferry parking area for ferry use.</p> <p>Q4: We must continue plan to relocate ferry access roadway to Japanese Gulch area to get ferry traffic out of center of Mukilteo. With good planning and design, this can be done with little environmental impact. The compact terminal plan will make a less costly, more environmentally friendly tie to the relocated access road.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
299	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: other- I use the area recreationally (diving)</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: other-This area of the Mukilteo waterfront is prime location for Dungeness Crab. The reason it is so good is the mussels that grow on the pilings of the government pier. Please leave as much of it in place as you can to protect this valuable resource.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-see above</p> <p>Q4: A couple of other considerations are the large quantity of rockfish which inhabit the "artificial reef" out in front of the tank farm and all the eel grass in the shallows. Both are vital to the health of the underwater environment. Another thought--there is a large concrete wall surrounding the backside of the farm--old broken concrete makes excellent material for artificial reefs. The area in front of the farm could really benefit from this.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
300	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other- Maintaining an acceptable view from the ridge above the proposed project. Economic impact on the tax base in Mukilteo.</p> <p>Q3: The compact alternative looks much more costly to build (over the water) I am against any buildings (condos) being built over 1 story on the tank farm property.</p> <p>Q5: other</p>
301	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
302	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-Negative impact on views</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Public parks and access to East of employee parking area (gray portion of graphic).</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
303	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Add commercial and residential space over parking. Get some tax revenue and create a destination and community.</p> <p>Q4: No road down the Gulch!</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>

304	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q2: other- It would be nice to add business (shops) to the area and make it a desired destination</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- If Japanese Gulch could be used as access to the new terminal (predesigned that way) so traffic could move smoother to i-5 and not just along the Mukilteo Speedway.</p> <p>Q4: Build it with a nice design for people and car movement so as our population increases we can enjoy it for years to come.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
305	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: This solution partially addresses the problems created in Mukilteo by westbound traffic. It ignores the existing problems created by westbound traffic. WSDOT needs to build turn lanes and install or modify the traffic signals at SR525 and Lincoln, Goat Trail Road, and 78th Street. A better solution to the westbound traffic problem is to move the ferry terminal to the mouth of Sound or Powder Mill Gulch. The latter is an old industrial site--close to the Mukilteo waterfront--that would be ideal. Both gulches provide a shorter route to SR 526 so if the state subsequently decided to build an additional route between SR 526 and the Mukilteo waterfront these would be far superior locations for their ferry terminal</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
306	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- I prefer the compact design only if the pier is eliminated or at least the decking and pipes.</p> <p>Q4: The proposal is much better than an eyesore. What the port does is important. Beach access is necessary.</p>
308	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Accommodations need to be made for ferry riders parking (walk-ons) and also strong considerations for direct connections to the freeway.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
309	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- Mukilteo City traffic needs to have #1 priority--as plans stand priority is given to the rail lines with little or no room along the waterfront for normal business traffic and ferry traffic and no provision for parking of cars by people trying to do business with the businesses along the waterfront.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: economic opportunities</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- another alternative is necessary. It needs to take into consideration how to get the ferry traffic to and from the ferry dock without impacting normal business and tourist traffic. The obvious answer is a new road connecting Paine Field Blvd. To the ferry dock through Japanese Gulch.</p> <p>Q4: Not enough park and ride parking to be provided. Too much emphasis on rail and bus facilities.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p> <p>Q5: other-internet</p>
310	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: other-Air Quality</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes- Split the route between Edmonds--keep two ferries to be retired in service--look to Everett as an alternative and viable site.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p> <p>Q5: other-internet</p>

311	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: other-traffic</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: The traffic problem is not being solved. You have to have traffic from 92nd. If you put the highway down the Gulch you would have access to the freeway passed Boeing then you have four lanes of freeway and four lanes of speedway through Paine field blvd. That makes sense--eight lanes to use to approach terminal. Waiting to finish the Gulch is going to cost millions more.</p> <p>Q5: other-internet</p>
313	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: Well, I guess my comments are that I think it would a fantastic improvement for Mukilteo if they would move ahead with this idea of the multimodal terminal integrating the trains and the train stop and Sounder stop into it, the ability for people to pick up buses, trains, going to downtown and move the traffic up Japanese Gulch, to move it away from the city. It would greatly improve Mukilteo and it will bring us into the century we should be, and I guess probably my preference is this Upland Terminal Alternative, I guess. We lived in Europe for quite a few years, and so the idea of in America of just trying to figure out ways to get more traffic, more cars on the roads, it seems insane to me, so the ability to have people come in, pick up a train and perhaps go downtown, or pick up a bus and go downtown, I think it would be a tremendous improvement to Mukilteo, to society. It is a good thing. I think it is critical, though, that the expansion of Japanese Gulch be somewhat integrated into this term in the expansion, because I think all of that is great to have that, but if they don't do something to move traffic off of the speedway, it's my thought, I think the traffic pattern and traffic flow and congestion will just continue to get worse. I guess I'm kind of surprised I don't see Japanese Gulch as part of this.</p>
323	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: other- If possible, I would like to see train service scheduled around Mariners and Seahawks home games</p> <p>Q4: Until this new terminal is open, I am concerned about the present access on the Mukilteo side for persons on the medical list having to physically get out of their car and walk to a ticket booth in order to hand off their fare or ticket. On the Clinton side, the persons are able to bypass the line and drive to one of the booths without having to physically leave their vehicle</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
326	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p> <p>Q5: friend</p>
328	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other- Most important issue is effect of increased traffic on Clinton.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: Major concern is how increased traffic will affect Clinton. We already feel like a divided town with all the traffic coming through. A plan needs to be made to deal with the effect of this.</p>
329	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: I like the compact terminal design as my preference I would think at this point, but, I don't like the traffic coming down the Speedway at Fifth, and the problem -- the traffic at Fifth and the Speedway is a disaster, so this would park a lot of cars for the ferry terminal, but traffic on the Speedway has got to be fixed.</p>

330	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: other- I live in downtown Mukilteo and the quality of my daily life is impacted by the traffic in my neighborhood.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-Issues of most importance are traffic and public access to the waterfront. You projections show traffic almost doubling in the next 25 years, yet this plan only addresses a small measure of the impacts of such growth. It seems that now is an ideal time to start planning for the increased traffic. Just building two slips and parking for an additional boatload sure does seem to fall short. By not addressing what and how we are to manage the traffic once it speeds off the boats we are missing opportunity. You may only be chartered with figuring out how to park the boat, but the citizens of the state deserve a more holistic approach. Why not a serious study of the cost of relocating the terminal to a site on this side that has the infrastructure in place to handle the almost 7,000,000 in passengers expected in 2030?</p> <p>Cost of boat operations is only one of the costs related to driving our state's integrated highway system. It is also expensive to build and maintain freeways and limited access roads as should be built off such and operation. Another advantage would be the decreased need for a multimodal station (Everett already has a good one). As for public access, it seems strange that you would want to put the ferry terminal in this new proposed location without serious consideration for waterfront access. If there really is no other option for terminal location, (and I seriously doubt this), then why not build it next to the new boondoggle Boeing pier that is going to reduce jobs once built, with taxpayer funds for a sole private industry user who will someday soon move all operations offshore anyway? By building the terminal in the middle of the tank farm and not on the eastern edge, you effectively chop the waterfront up, cutting foot traffic off from wandering from old areas to new areas. The loading and unloading of 7,000,000 passengers is sure to take precedence over any wandering foot traffic. By building at the end instead of the middle of the parcel, many other options are opened up. Please consider. By moving it here you also make it easier to tie the terminal to a potential new road leading to the terminal. Remember, most of the 7,000,000 ferry users are not local.</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-make shoreline impacts as small as possible.</p>
334	Scoping Mailer	Having a home on Whidbey Island and travel on one of the best ferry systems in the world makes me and my family very interested and proud of our transportation management.
339	Scoping Mailer	<p>Please get the ferry traffic off the speedway ASAP.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p>
340	Scoping Mailer	A much needed improvement. You have my full support
341	Scoping Mailer	Would like to include a coffee shop to sit and enjoy the beauty and ferry activity, even if not going to ride the ferry that day.
346	Scoping Mailer	<p>Keep in mind the potential impact to the Mukilteo Boulevard with the added traffic going to Everett using that road.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p>
351	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q4: Considerations for commuter parking need to be made. Offsite parking is needed. We need more offsite commuter parking (park and ride) and better access to it. Perhaps a shuttle to parking lots. Do what you can to promote walk on traffic. For safety and traffic flow, extend the overhead walkway all the way across the railroad tracks. If not, people will be crossing the tracks at great danger.</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
352	Scoping Mailer	Thanks for thinking ahead!
353	Scoping Mailer	<p>Why not consider a one-way single lane up the "gulch" to handle traffic leaving the ferry? Cheaper than and quicker than widening SR 525 - continue to use SR 525 for on traffic.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p>
354	Scoping Mailer	<p>What's the expected increase in traffic load for the Mukilteo Speedway? What's the environmental impact for the people that live along the Mukilteo Speedway?</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: environment</p>
355	Scoping Mailer	Maximize and encourage bike friendly features. Impacts to Puget Sound and nearby beach areas should be minimized or mitigated. Public access to all beach areas should be maximized. Traffic and noise impacts to Mukilteo and SR 526 should be minimized as a priority item. Access to this terminal through approaches other than SR 526 should be pursued.
369	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other-I use the ferry for doctor's appointments and easy access to trains to attend sports facilities, i.e. baseball, basketball, and sea-turkeys.</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: Connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other-After reviewing the proposed plans, I suggested to one of your planners (or architect or engineer) that you should definitely look at installing a belt conveyor (i.e. LinkBelt) for moving people with packages etc. from buses, trains, to the ferries and vice-versa on the walkway. Look at Sea-Tac or L.A. International for inspiration.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-see above.</p> <p>Q4: The plans look great. Good luck!</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>

376	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live and work in Clinton.</p> <p>Q2: The most important issue to me is the effect the terminal will have on Clinton. The traffic through town will exacerbate an existing problem, particularly safety and parking and the bisecting of our community.</p> <p>Q4: Clinton will be on the receiving end of any additional ferry service and should be studied as part of the development of the Mukilteo terminal. Highway 525 has recently been the subject of possibly being designated a scenic highway on Whidbey Island and the Mukilteo-Clinton ferry is the southerly gateway to that scenic highway.</p>
383	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q1: other- I live in Mukilteo and occasionally ride the ferry. I am commenting for Skagit River System Cooperative the fisheries management unit for the Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribes. The Point Elliot area is within the U and A (Usual and Accustomed) fishing rights area of the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community.</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to the waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-Protecting and improving the marine and riparian environment. Tribal access to the waterfront. Tribal access to marine harvest opportunities for ceremonial and commercial purposes. Preservation of Native American archaeological sites.</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-Prefer the least over-water footprint effects to the near shore marine habitat. Want to see the stream at the east end of the project (Japanese Gulch?) freed to flow in a more natural stream bed to its mouth and allowed to from its original pocket estuary habitat and natal near shore and natal stream potential free of man made obstructions and barriers.</p> <p>Q4: Want to preserve tribal fin-fishing patterns and methods. Want to preserve tribal shellfish trapping and gathering sites and methods.</p> <p>Q5: Other</p>
384	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q4: My question is: If I'm coming down the Speedway -- I have to point out two things: You have people that will come around you and go in the ferry lane and then cut back in front of me when you're going the speed limit; that's one issue. The second issue is they don't heed -- when you're coming down -- I live on Third, so when I'm going to take a right to go home along -- the ferry commuters don't stop at intersections, they just keep going, so he said something about the Washington State Patrol issue -- well, that's another issue, and then the third issue is people that are at the light -- the other day it happened. I'm at the light, there's another guy in the lane next to me. The light for me is green, his is red for the ferry, and he went through the light at the same time. If I can bring those comments to the State Patrol, that would be awesome.</p>
386	Scoping Mailer	As a fourth generation Whidbey Island landowner, I fully support fast-track development of the multimodal terminal.
387	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider (m-f daily)</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: Public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-Re-route to Edmonds. I prefer a longer ride to actually enjoy my paper and coffee.</p> <p>Q4: Edmonds terminal is being relocated. Expand it to include more deck space to handle Clinton. Since 3 boats are being considered on Mukilteo/Clinton, putting 3 boats on the new Edmonds/Clinton run will keep current ridership levels equal. I'm not interested in increasing ridership. This will be an effective deterrent to growth.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
388	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative (I think)</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-I am concerned about the pollution, the destruction of eelgrass, car fumes, oil in the water, species reduction, air quality.</p>
389	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: other-Very concerned about sunlight filtering for eelgrass health, storm runoff and petroleum products, copper, metals from vehicles, non-point pollution issues. Spawning grounds, water quality issues, the whole picture for long-term impact (100 years) not just short term.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative (the terminal with the least amount of impact on our island community)</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-I believe a land based operation would have less impact on water issues.</p> <p>Q5: friend</p>
390	Clinton Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: connections to bus, train, bike</p> <p>Q2: other-Stormwater that's contaminated by vehicle-related chemicals/hydrocarbons/heavy metals. Bio-cleanup of stormwater is my recommendation.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative.</p>

391	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q2: environment Q2: other-Concern about near shore environment, eelgrass beds. What about storm water runoff with toxic pollutants e.g. copper and nickel from brakes and tires as well as petroleum products? Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q3: suggested changes-It would leave beach for public access and education as well as being more cost effective in the long run. Q5: friend
392	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider Q1: My business is affected by the ferry Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: connections to bus, train, bike Q2: public access to waterfront Q2: economic opportunities Q2: other-Community collaboration and village atmosphere – walking strategies. Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative Q3: A bridge overpass is needed to connect people from Mukilteo Blvd. to the terminal so they don't walk on train tracks. Also, we need overnight parking and a shuttle to and from parking. Q5: newspaper
393	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I'm a regular ferry rider Q2: traffic Q2: connections to bus, train, bike Q3: No preference Q3: suggested changes-Ferries should be converted to handle quicker load and unload. Q5: newspaper Q5: other-on ferry
394	Scoping Mailer	The community of Clinton is the other part of this project that has been ignored. The traffic impact here needs to be studied and remedied too!
396	Clinton Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby (Greenbank on Whidbey) Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider Q2: traffic Q2: parking Q2: safety Q2: environment Q2: connections to bus, train, bike Q2: other-Catching ferries on a timely basis without waiting 2 to 3 ferries at peak times. Q3: No preference Q3: Elderly people from the island need a way to transport packages, luggage, etc. from train station, bus station to ferries. Perhaps a people mover belt, or luggage transport carts like at the airports would be very beneficial. The distance from the ferry terminal to the train station appears like a long distance for some elderly people to walk. Q4: A class on how to use the trains, buses and ferries once a year would be nice for the public, especially new residents. This should include trips into Seattle, Everett and how to make connections to SeaTac airport. Q5: newspaper
397	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	Q1: I live nearby Q2: traffic Q3: both Q3: suggested changes-2010 traffic projections show 290 vehicles. Compact Terminal Alt. only holds 260 cars, need parking area shown on upland terminal to keep cars off the surface streets. Q4: Need to keep cars off the surface streets for safety. Q5: newspaper
398	Scoping Mailer	Please put a temporary train platform @ Mukilteo ferry ASAP while building everything else! Thank you.
399	E-mail Request	I have lived on south Whidbey for the past 11 years and I must say, I believe it would be much more of benefit to have a bridge built from the mainland to Whidbey island. The tolls along would more than compensate the State for the cost of the bridge. After riding the ferry system for the past 11 years from Clinton to the mainland has been at the most just less than average when complaining the other bridges in the state of Washington. I know there would be very strong support for a bridge verses the ferry system. Is this an option? Why not? The public would sustain the cost of such a project. Besides this would improve the costs of the ferry system by eliminating two ferries from the system with the run from the mainland to Clinton. Lots of \$\$\$. I appreciate your time and effort in this project.
400	Scoping Mailer	We would really like to see the ferry traffic off the Mukilteo Speedway by the time this project is completed—the congestion can be terrible.
401	Scoping Mailer	Go for it ASAP!

403	Scoping Mailer	<p>I live in the Goat Trail Road area of Mukilteo. My input for the Mukilteo community meeting tonight is as follows:</p> <p>1) Get the train station part of the multi-modal facility working NOW! There's no good reason why Mukilteans have to drive 20 minutes to get to the Everett station. Even a temporary platform would be fine. An interim solution is better than no solution.</p> <p>2) Access to the ferry terminal should MINIMIZE impact to the Japanese Gulch. Right now Japanese Gulch is a haven to bikers, hikers, and horse-back riders. It is one of the last vestiges of our forested past. This is currently privately-owned land, with land-owners speculatively holding their property until the government installs infrastructure that will make it easy to develop their land. My view is that the entire Gulch area should be bought by city, county, or state government and kept as an un-improved park land. If the trade-off for this is to put a road down the middle of the Gulch while guaranteeing the remainder of the land remains permanently un-developed, then I say, "So be it."</p> <p>3) Parking lots should never take priority over community-based business or residential or park uses of land.</p> <p>4) The new Boeing pier must be designed to minimize visual/environmental impact. Can its footprint be integrated into the multi-modal facility footprint?</p>
406	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q2: traffic</p> <p>Q2: parking</p> <p>Q2: safety</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-How local people will be impacted re: increased traffic flow—how the environment will be affected?? I don't want what little natural habitat we have left to be destroyed so that my child does not get to enjoy Japanese Gulch as it is today (Nov. 2004).</p> <p>Q3: No preference</p> <p>Q3: suggested changes-Just be sure that local traffic and access to waterfront is available to those of us who live around here. Also-That height limits are NOT raised which will affect views and property values.</p> <p>Q4: Major problem—lots of people like to pass myself and others when following local speed limits and pass us in the ferry lane and return to main road. Also- like to run red lights while in ferry lanes as well as block local streets and make it difficult to turn down 3rd and 2nd streets.</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing</p>
409	Scoping Mailer	We have long supported ferry connection to rail. Promote non-motorized transport, especially biking, solving ferry backups.
410	Scoping Mailer	Go for it!
412	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I'm and occasional ferry rider (3 times per year)</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q4: Please keep our city in mind...we are more than just a transportation hub for the state!</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
413	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-Keeping as much public space and green space as possible</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: newspaper</p>
414	Mukilteo Scoping Meeting	<p>Q1: I live nearby</p> <p>Q1: I'm an occasional ferry rider</p> <p>Q2: environment</p> <p>Q2: public access to waterfront</p> <p>Q2: other-Pedestrian access. Small public fishing pier.</p> <p>Q3: I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative</p> <p>Q5: notice mailing.</p>
419	Scoping Mailer	I am so looking forward to the completion of this project and the options it gives us!
420	Scoping Mailer	There must be an easy access Park and Ride close to the ferry. During the summer my husband could commute to Kirkland if he could park in Mukilteo (but park close to the ferry, not 1/2 mile away).
422	Scoping Mailer	I think the prices are going up fast than cost-of-living. I cannot believe the system wasted all the income (from food) on the Mukilteo ferry by forcing the provider out.

Scoping Open House Comment Form

- Q1. What is the primary reason you are interested in the Mukilteo Multimodal Ferry Terminal Project?
I live nearby____
I'm a regular ferry rider____
I'm an occasional ferry rider____
My business is affected by the ferry____
Other____
- Q2. What issues are most important to you about this project?
Traffic____
Parking____
Safety____
Environment____
Connections to bus, train, bike____
Public access to waterfront____
Economic opportunities____
Other____
- Q3. Do you have a preference for either the Compact or Upland Terminal Alternative? If not, what changes should Washington State Ferries consider?
I prefer the Compact Terminal Alternative____
I prefer the Upland Terminal Alternative____
No preference____
Please consider changes as described____
- Q4. Other comments____
- Q5. How did you hear about this meeting?
Notice mailed to my home____
Newspaper____
Friend____
Other____

###